REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification and abstract have been correspondingly amended without adding new matters and will be explained as below.

The title of the invention has been changed to "INTEGRATED CIRCUIT PACKAGE HAVING A RESISTANT LAYER FOR STOPPING FLOWED GLUE" to make the invention descriptive. In fact, the resistant layer is used to stop the flowed glue and prevent the flowed glue from covering the connection points in the wiring region. So, the title is amended without adding new matters

In the specification, the changes include the following features without adding new matters.

1. Some grammar errors, awkward and confusing usage and incorrect verb tenses have been corrected.

2. The resistant layer 42 separates the long slot 56 from the wiring region 58, as shown in the original FIGS. 3 and 2.

3. A length of the resistant layer 42 is substantially equal to the length of the wiring region 58, as shown in the original FIGS. 3 and 2.

4. The resistant layer 42 is in contact with the lower surface 54 of the substrate 40, as shown in the original FIG. 2.

Claims 1 and 3-4 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 3-4 have been amended according to the amended specification. Claim 2 has been amended according to the amended specification and FIGS. 3 and 2 without adding new matters.

Claim objections

The examiner objects to the claims because they include reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses.

The claims has been amended to remove the reference characters.

The examiner objects to claim 3.

Claim 3 has been amended to remove "is".

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The examiner rejects claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Chang (US 6,232,551).

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejections according to the following features:

1. the resistant layer is in contact with the lower surface of the substrate;

2. the resistant layer separates the long slot from the wiring region; and

3. a length of the resistant layer is substantially equal to the length of the wiring region.

In Chang's patent, as shown in FIGS. 5E and 7 of Chang, the examiner's admitted resistant layer 52 is disposed on the metallic film 40, the metallic film 40 is disposed on a top circuit layer 32, and the top circuit layer 32 is disposed on and in contact with the ***upper surface (not the examiner's admitted lower surface)*** of the substrate 34 because the examiner also thinks that the glue layer 58 is coated on the ***upper surface*** of the substrate 34 (See FIG. 7). Thus, the resistant layer 52 is **not** in contact with the upper (or lower) surface of the substrate 34.

In addition, the examiner's admitted resistant layer 52 of Chang is a metallic film preferably made of nickel and gold (col. 4, lines 22-23), and the bonding pads 44a below the examiner's admitted resistant layer 52 are divided into multiple blocks (see FIG. 4 of Chang). Thus, the examiner's admitted resistant layer 52 is also divided into multiple blocks. If the examiner's admitted resistant layer 52 is not divided into multiple blocks, the bonding pads 44a will be electrically connected to the examiner's admitted resistant layer 52 because the layer 52 is a conductive layer. If all the bonding pads 44a are electrically connected to the one and only one conductive layer 52, the existence of the bonding pads 44a will be meaningless in the semiconductor field. So, the length of the resistant layer of Chang is not substantially equal to the length of the wiring region if **the length** of the wiring region (44a, 44, 44b) is smaller than a length of the long slot (38, 54) of the substrate because **the length** of the wiring region (44a, 44, 44b) is well defined and the length of one divided resistant layer 52 is shorter than the length of the wiring region.

In this invention, the resistant is in contact with the **lower surface** of the substrate, the resistant layer separates the long slot from the wiring region, and a length of the resistant layer is substantially equal to the length of the wiring region. So, Chang never discloses or teaches the features of the claimed invention, as amended.

If Chang's via 36 is regarded as the resistant layer of this claimed invention, it is completely different from the resistant layer of the claimed invention. As shown in FIG. 4 of Chang, the vias 36 are separated from each other, so the length of the via is not equal to the length of the wiring regions if **the length** of the wiring region (44a, 44, 44b) is smaller than a length of the long slot (38, 54) of the substrate because **the length** of the wiring region (44a, 44, 44b) is well defined and the length of one via 36 is shorter than the length of the wiring region. In addition, there are some gaps between the vias 36, so the via 36 still cannot separate the long slot from the wiring region.

Consequently, the amended claim 1 is never anticipated by Chang. Considerations of the amended claim 1 and its dependent claims 3-4 are therefore politely requested.

In light of the above-mentioned amendments and remarks, Applicant now asserts that all of the grounds for objection and rejection have been traversed or overcome by amendments, and that all of the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of the objections and rejections, and solicits allowance of the present claims at an early date.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 07.11.06

Joe Liu

Title of Officer: President of Kingpak Technology Inc.,
the Assignee of this application

Address: No. 84, Taiho Road, Chupei, Hsinchu Hsien, Taiwan